DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 527 EA 003 950

AUTHOR Campbell, Roald F.
TITLE Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education.
PUB DATE Aug 71
NOTE 43p.; Paper prepared for Education Commission of the States conference (Jackson Hole, Wyoming, August 9-11, 1971)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; Decentralization; Educational Accountability; Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Federal Government; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Government Role; Humanism; *Interagency Cooperation; *Organizational Change; Policy Formation

ABSTRACT

Schools are currently under the many strains and stresses involving change, such as concern with the nature and purpose of schools, the growth of alternative systems, the push for new structures, the demands of new participants, financial worries, and interventions from State and national agencies. Each of these strains creates problems in educational governance and policymaking, sometimes necessitating administrative reorganization or disruption of the usual relations among educational governing agencies. To solve the crises in educational governance, an intergovernmental approach is necessary with emphasis on (1) the interdependence, rather than the local, State, and national governing powers; (2) the importance of the pivotal position of the State in making the federal system work; (3) the need to give education a more strategic place in Federal Government priorities and to augment federal assistance to education; and (4) the continuation of local school districts but with some restructuring and greater collaboration with other governmental jurisdictions. (RA)

ED 059527

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION*

Roald F. Campbell

For several months officers of the Education Commission of the States and I have been discussing the need for a comprehensive study directed at emerging directions in the governance of education. We propose in that study to examine the important policy decisions for education and to determine how they are made, to note the variations among selected states in the structures and processes of policy making for education, and to develop some promising alternative models for the governance of education. Obviously, the study has not been made. Despite the lack of empirical data and extensive analysis which such a study would generate, I am being asked to present a position paper in the general domain of the projected study. While this assignment may be premature, my interest in the problem prompts me to respond. Should the proposed study be made, I may want the opportunity to present some amendments.

I suggested to the planners of this meeting that I could name a political scientist and an educationist who would represent positions more extreme than those Alan Campbell and I will present. Alan Campbell, as you know, is not only a student of politics but also of education. He and his colleagues in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University have conducted a number of important studies in education. Also, I have attempted in my own work to view policy making in education not only from an educational

* Prepared for conference sponsored by the Education Commission of the States, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, August 9-11, 1971

EA 003 950

perspective but also from a political perspective. In a sense, Alan Campbell has moved toward education and I have moved toward political science. I hope these developments have extended our understandings and not merely hardened our prejudices.

A position paper seems to represent a blend of fact, analysis, interpretation, value judgment, and hope. I shall try to differentiate between and among these several ingredients but I am not sure I can always do so. With respect to our topic, intergovernmental relations and the governance of education, I shall first take a look at education, dealing with some of its current strains and stresses; note the governance problems among local, state, and national levels; consider the governance problems at each of these levels; and then move toward some kind of rationale for the governance of education as part of a complex social system.

STRAINS AND STRESSES IN EDUCATION

When we speak about the governance of education, it should be clear that we are really dealing with the governance of formal educational institutions, namely, schools and colleges. Education goes on in many settings: the family, the church, the neighborhood, the street gang, the boy scout troop, the museum, the library, the music hall, before the television screen, at work, and in countless other places. Indeed, education is an integral part of our culture, our social order, our very lives. In any of these settings education can be good or bad, depending upon the values we attach to the outcomes. Or, it can be intensive or random contingent upon the nature of the interaction between the situation and the person. I make this distinction between education and schooling for the reason that such a differentiation is frequently neglected and this neglect can distort one's views of the problems and the possible modifications needed in educational governance.

Even in looking at formal schooling we are confronted with at least six major programs. These include elementary and secondary education, higher education, the community college, vocational and technical education, adult education, and preschool education. Each of these programs is subject to further elaboration. The most obvious breakdown is public and non-public. While the governance of education applies most directly and completely to the control of public schools and colleges, nonpublic schools and colleges reveal a number of sub-divisions worth noting. Some of the nonpublic schools are church related, others are often grouped under the term independent, and still others might be categorized as reform or protest institutions. In this last group we might place a rapidly growing number of free schools, street academies, and other emerging institutions. Most nonpublic schools are nonprofit institutions but a number of proprietary institutions, particularly for training in business and some other vocations, still exist. Finally, we should recognize that a great many programs in both general and vocational subjects are sponsored by business firms, social agencies, and other organizations.

In addition to giving some consideration to the many educational programs which need governance, we must also consider how people now perceive education if we are to effect appropriate governmental arrangements. There is at present a rather wide-spread disenchantment with education. This is probably due, in part, to the general disenchantment with the performance of many of our institutions. Clearly, we are not doing very well with foreign policy, with the administration of justice, with the care of the poor, with the delivery of health services, with the purification of air and water, nor with the provision of quality education for all. But education may have an even greater cross to bear. For more than a century schooling has become a kind of religion in our nation. Such provisions as the establishment of public school systems, compulsory education, t.e growth of high schools, land grant colleges, community colleges, state equalization programs, and especially during the 1960s substantial

national intervention in education all expressed our great faith in the efficacy of the educational enterprise. Important as each of these developments has been in our national development, we are victims of over expectation. Schools alone cannot solve all the problems of poverty, race, morality, job opportunity, domestic tranquility, foreign relations, or personal value orientation. In fact some critics, notably Illich, think we must actually deschool our society. Illich insists that we have confused "teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new."[1]

I doubt that we are quite as guilty as Illich suggests, but I think the tendency to confuse schooling and education, as noted above, is with us. I am not yet ready to scrap all schools and colleges. At the same time, doubt about their usefulness has helped create some of the strains and stresses in education to which a program of governance must give heed.

Redefinition of the school

In a sense, we are being asked to redefine the nature and purpose of the school. I shall speak more of the school than I do the college but many of the criticisms also pertain to higher education. There are two predominant themes in the current literature on American education. The first, well represented in Silberman's volume, Crisis in the Classroom, is the insistence that schools be made more humane. Silberman's chief criticism of the schools is suggested in the following:

> Most of all, however, I am indignant at the failures of the public schools themselves. "The most deadly of all possible sins," Erik Erikson suggests, "is the mutilation of a child's spirit". It is not possible to spend any

---

[1] Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1970, p.1.

> prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere-- mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self. The public schools-- those "killers of the dream," to appropriate a phrase of Lillian Smith's-- are the kind of institution one cannot really dislike until one gets to know them well. Because adults take the schools so much for granted, they fail to appreciate what grim, joyless places most American Schools are, how oppressive and petty are the rules by which they are governed, how intellectually sterile and esthetically barren the atmosphere, what an appalling lack of civility obtains on the part of teachers and principals, what contempt they unconsciously display for children as children.[1]

Many teachers and school administrators read the excerpt shown above with some shock. They find it hard to believe that the institutions in which they work and which they have helped shape are inhumane. They find it even harder to believe that as individual persons in those institutions that they behave in inhumane ways. However, a number of parents and students find much justification in Silberman's words.

The Silberman study and other pronouncements of similar tone have helped create and sustain the movement for more humane schools. As is true with many movements, adherents are of many kinds. Some see this as the new thing in education and as opportunists they wish to be on the band wagon. Others wish to examine school practices to determine if indeed they are inhumane and if so how they can be appropriately modified. In some ways, the move to make schools more humane is similar to the progressive education movement of the 1920-s and 1930-s. There is talk about the whole child, affective as well as cognitive development is stressed, individual interest is seen as one of the keystones in learning, and much emphasis is placed on an informal school atmosphere.

---

[1]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970, p. 10.

The primary schools in England are seen as the best models of the new schools and many American educators are now making pilgrimages to the new Mecca. Teachers colleges have organized courses on humane schools; supervisors in school systems have a new gospel to promulgate; and teachers are being asked to modify their practices to be less formal, to give more attention to pupil interest, and to treat each youngster as a unique human being. Some parents, particularly in upper middle-class suburbs, have also heard of the movement and have become adherents. Such parents attempt to get modifications in public school practice. If not successful in that effort, some of them join together and form a free school of their own.

The second current thrust in American education is the accountability movement. The term, itself, means different things to different people and this helps explain its popularity. To some, accountability means more complete reporting on what is being done and with what results. To others, accountability means a guarantee of a specified outcome. To many, accountability deals with defined purposes, specified procedures, and full reporting of results. The accountability movement has obvious relationships to such formulations as management by objectives, program budgeting, and cost-benefit analysis.

Some of these ideas, as you know, have been around some time. The program budget (PPBS) was apparently used with some success by Secretary McNamara in the Department of Defense and President Johnson, by Executive Order, requested in 1965 that the formulation be applied to all federal agencies. In 1967 Secretary Gardner prepared guide-lines and asked that the practice be applied to HEW including the U.S. Office of Education. From that time on attempts at program budgeting were made in federal education projects and the idea was often advocated for state and local educational agencies.

Leon Lessinger, one time Associate Commissioner of Education in the USOE, did much to promote the idea of accountability in education. For him,

the performance contract was the epitome of accountability as can be seen in the following:

> Accountability is the product of a process. At its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contractual agreement to perform a service will be held answerable for performing according to agreed-upon terms, within an established time period, and with a stipulated use of resources and performance standards. This definition of accountability requires that the parties to the contract keep clear and complete records and that this information be available for outside review. It also suggests penalties and rewards; accountability without redress or incentive is mere rhetoric.[1]

I do not think, as Lessinger may suggest, that accountability and the performance contract are identical. I do see the performance contract as one expression of the accountability movement. The idea behind the performance contract is a simple one. Usually, the school system specifies certain desired outcomes, defines a target group of pupils, stipulates some of the conditions under which the instruction is to take place, and enters into a contract with an agency - most frequently a private firm - for the provision of instructional experiences designed to bring the target group of pupils to the desired outcomes. Payment to the contractor is contingent on the achievement or performance of the pupil with respect to the specified outcomes. Testing of pupil achievement is usually determined by nationally normed achievement tests and often administered by an outside testing contractor.

It is significant to note that in the 1969-70 school year there were but two performance contracts, the now famous Texarkana case and one in Portland, Oregon, whereas in 1970-71 there were over 50 such contracts.[2] Twenty of this number were supported by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The others were supported in a variety of ways, some by the use of USOE funds

---

[1] Leon Lessinger, "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education" Phi Delta Kappan. 52(Dec. 1970) 217-225.

[2] See Roald F. Campbell & James E Lorion, Performance Contracting in Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., - in press.

and others by regular school district revenues. While these contracts have not been implemented without problems, they have demonstrated that educational objectives can be defined in specific terms, that instructional procedures can be carefully programmed, that teachers and teaching aids can be trained to implement the procedures, and that pupils - even those below grade standard - can improve their achievement in such areas as reading and mathematics. One can argue about the nature of such a program, about the types of motivation employed, about the validity of test results; but, for many, the contractors have demonstrated what the schools, in many cases, could not or would not demonstrate, that business procedures can be applied successfully to instruction.

In many ways these two movements, accountability and humaneness, are in conflict. The accountability movement stresses precise objectives, planned allocation of resources, specified procedures, and measurement of outcomes. The humane or informal school, on the other hand, places great stress on spontaneity, flexibility, individual differences, and creative experiences not only in the academic subjects but also in the arts. There is little concern with measurement and great concern with feeling, joy, and openness. One movement is highly rational and precise. The other is largely impressionistic and flexible. In many ways, it is the difference between a science and an art.

Both movements are causing schools and colleges to examine their nature and purpose. Clearly, no school or college can move completely in both directions. How far toward humaneness and how far toward accountability and in what ways these two movements can be made to complement each other are the questions confronting both professionals and laymen in education. This dilemma, compounded with the Illich remedy that we ought to deschool society altogether, make many persons quite uneasy about the whole educational enterprise.

It is conceivable that both humaneness and accountability are, in a sense, passing enthusiasms and symtomatic of a more fundamental problem. Green[1] has suggested, for instance, that the present crisis in education stems from our general belief in the efficacy of education, particularly our conviction that all youth should complete high school, and our almost complete success in attaining that goal. Now we are faced with new conditions which seem to demand that we examine the basic assumptions upon which our educational system of the past century has been based. In any case, the nature and the purpose of the school and college is being seriously questioned.

New organizational structures

Another response to the questions being raised about schools is the push for new organizational structures. This is perhaps most clearly seen in the demand for decentralization characteristic of most of our cities. Again, we are confronted with a word which has different meanings for different people. Even so, in New York City the decentralization movement has been responsible for the creation of thirty-one school districts for the operation of elementary schools. Each of these districts now has a board of education and a superintendent of schools. Presumably, citizens also feel that they can exercise more influence with these local boards than they could with the city-wide board which preceded them. It should be noted that the operation of high schools is still a centralized function as is the financing of all of the schools.

As of January, 1971 the Detroit schools were also decentralized by the creation of a thirteen-member Central Board of Education and eight five-member regional boards of education. The chairman of each of the regional boards is included in the membership of the central board. The

---

[1]Thomas Green, "The Ironies of Educational Growth." Bode lecture, Ohio State University, 1971.

Detroit plan does not go as far by way of decentralization as the New York plan but it does change appreciably governance arrangements for the Detroit schools. Almost every city, even those with a quarter the population of Detroit, have given some consideration to decentralization.

While cities are experiencing a decentralization thrust, the long time effort to combine school districts in rural areas continues. Over the nation there are now about 18,000 operating school districts, whereas twenty years ago that number was over 100,000. States have responded very unevenly to the reducation of school districts. Hawaii has but one school district, while Nebraska still has over 3,000 such units. States with many rural school districts will probably continue to effect consolidations when program and financial advantages can be demonstrated.

There is also considerable discussion at this time about the creation of metropolitan governing units of one kind or another. Little actual movement in this direction has taken place. One notable example seems to have been the creation of Nashville-Davidson County school district in Tennessee. Of particular interest in that case is the fact that metropolitan school government tended to follow the creation of metropolitan municipal government.[1] School districts in a number of Southern states embrace an entire county, hence in some cases by their very nature they are metropolitan districts. The Dade County, Florida school district is perhaps the best example of this condition. School districts in other metropolitan areas have cooperated for specific purposes but few areas have chosen to follow the Nashville example and go all the way.

Related to the metropolitan school district idea has been a movement to reconceive the county or intermediate school district which still

---

[1]Robert J. Havighurst (Editor), Metropolitanism - Its Challenge to Education. Chicago: 67th NSSE Yearbook, Part I, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1968, ch. 16.

persists in many Northern states. The typical county office, particularly in some of the Midwest and Western states, is an anachronism of the last century when the county superintendent was supposed to supervise as many as one hundred one-room schools. In recent years, it has become clear that the office ought to be eliminated altogether or it should become a service unit staffed to provide specialized help to smaller schools in those areas not economically feasible in each of the school districts. In this reconception it has become clear that such an office in sparsely settled areas can serve the schools in more than one county. Notable progress has been made in such states as Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin[1] in the reorganization of intermediate districts, often including several counties. In many ways, the intermediate district may come to provide some of the functions for rural areas that a central office in a decentralized city school district could provide to the local or regional districts within the city.

Movements for the creation of new structures whether regional districts in a city, a combination of districts in a rural area, or the generation of an effective intermediate office all add to the strains and stresses now being felt in education.

More participants

Schools are experiencing still another kind of stress. Within the past few years participants, once rather quiet, have insisted upon a voice in policy making. These outspoken partners include many blacks and representatives, other minority groups, teachers, and students. Regarding school performance, the blacks tend to agree in thinking that schools have not done well in teaching the

---

[1] Roald F. Campbell et. al. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970, ch. 5.

children of the poor and indeed test results tend to support them in such a position. Blacks are not of one mind about the remedies which should be applied to the situation. Many of them believe that the solution is to be found through desegreation and ultimately genuine integration in the schools. Some blacks, on the other hand, particularly after observing some attempts at desegreation, often including the busing of black kids but not white kids, insist upon separate schools for blacks. Blacks in both camps have become quite cynical about the commitment of whites to any plan of equal educational opportunity for all children and youth. This cynicism is often fed by the inability of local school boards to get white support for desegregation plans and by what many perceive to be a vacilation regarding school desegregation by the President and the Congress.

In any case, school boards are confronted with demands from blacks and other minorities for improved education. These demands often include more black teachers and principals and the establishment of black studies programs. At times demands also include community control of the schools, a move many blacks perceive as equivalent to the control now exercised by citizens in suburban school districts. Clearly, school boards have difficulty in meeting all of these demands. Lack of movement promotes dissatisfaction on the part of the blacks and that dissatisfaction gets expressed in many ways including the defeat of bond issues and operating levies proposed by the school districts.

Teachers have also become militant partners in the school enterprise. The day when school boards and superintendents might treat teachers in a benevolent but patronizing manner is gone in many districts. Local teachers organizations, whether affiliated with the National Education Association or with the American Federation of Teachers, insist upon reviewing school budgets, upon playing a role in the establishment of personnel policies, and upon making their own demands regarding salaries and working conditions. When teachers find that local boards cannot

meet their requests, they frequently join forces and put pressure upon the governor, the state legislature, and even the Congress and the President.

Two outcomes of teacher militancy will be noted. At the state level twenty-six states have passed laws which recognize in one or more ways teachers organizations and legitimize the negotiating process.[1] Even in states without such laws negotiation is now very much a fact of life. A second problem for school boards resides in the fact that many demands made by teachers run counter to those made by school patrons, particularly blacks and other minority groups. For instance, teachers are strong for certification and examination procedures for admission into the profession, while blacks see many of these programs as designed to screen blacks out of the profession. Again, teachers are strong for the right to transfer in the school system, while blacks see such a desire as a way of removing experienced, and presumably more capable teachers, from the slum schools. The fact remains that school boards must mediate between teachers and minority patrons, frequently almost an impossible task.

Students, too, particularly at the secondary level, have become more articulate in demanding a voice in educational policy making. Frequently, these demands have led to the disruption of the schools. The House Sub-committee on General Education became involved in a study of student activism and sent a questionnaire to all of the nation's 29,000 public and nonpublic secondary schools seeking information about disruptions occurring in 1968-69. More than fifty percent of the schools responded and eighteen percent of them had experienced "serious protests." The major issues involved were rules, dress codes, services and facilities, and curriculum matters. In more than fifty percent of the cases

---

[1] Compact, February, 1971.

there were racial overtones in the protests.[1] In the Syracuse survey directed by Bailey, eighty-five percent of the urban high schools reported some type of disruption in the last three years.[2] These disruptions included student boycotts, arson, property damage, and student-teacher physical confrontation.

In a very real sense, citizens in minority groups, teachers, and students have demanded a voice in school governance. Add to this augmented intervention on the part of both state and national agencies and we can understand why boards of education are overwhelmed with their new partners.

Lack of money

Still an additional problem in education today, and in some ways a product of attempts to meet other stresses, is the great difficulty encountered in financing education. In a recent study of superintendents the financing of education was reported almost to the man, as the most serious problem confronting education.[3] This dilemma is clearly reflected in the increasing percentage of operating levies and school bond issues defeated by the voters in one district after another. Two decades ago 99 percent of the operating levies in Ohio received voter approval. Today the figure is 29 percent.

Federal aid, which in the 1960's rose from about four percent to eight percent of the total bill for elementary and secondary education, has actually decreased to 6.7 percent. The percentage of revenue from state sources, over the past decade has changed very little, actually averaging for all the states thirty-nine to forty percent over that entire period. With school costs rising faster than the gross national product,

---

[1] Reported in Stephen K. Bailey, Disruption in Urban Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: Nat. Assn. of Secondary School Principals., 1970.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Russell T. Gregg & Stephen J. Knezevich, "The Superintendent: What Makes Him What He is?" American School Board Journal. 158 (June 1971) 12-17.

with costs for higher education rising even more rapidly, and with an economic recession, all within the context of disenchantment with schools and colleges, prospects for adequate financing are certainly not bright.

By way of reiteration, I have noted the concern with the nature and purpose of the school, the development of new organizational structures, the emergence of new partners in policy making, and finally the financial stress faced by educational institutions. In addition, there is a movement to establish alternative schools, a point to be elaborated later. This enumeration could suggest that I see no hope in the schools and colleges as we have known them. This is not the impression I wish to convey. In spite of all of these problems, many pupils are learning, much effective teaching is going on, and many parents are pleased with what is happening to their children. Our very success convinces us that we are not doing well enough. As with the larger society, schools are at a watershed. There must be re-examination and reform. This reform will have implications for governance. It seems quite possible that the governance model of consensus, characteristic of schools over the last several decades, will give way to a model which can deal more effectively with conflict. In any case school governance must pay more attention to the pluralistic nature of our society.

GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS AMONG LEVELS

It seems desirable to distinguish between general and special government for education. At the national level there is government for education; education is very much a function of general government. In other words, all three branches of government deal with education as they deal with other matters. By way of greatest contrast, education at the local level, in large part, tends to be a case of special government. The local board of education as a state agency is usually independent of municipal authority. School board members are, with some exceptions, elected by the voters of the school district, which may or may not conform to

municipal boundaries, frequently in a special election, and nearly always on a nonpartisan ticket. At the state level education is governed by a mixture of special and general government.

Forms of government designed specifically to cope with education have developed in every state. In nearly all states a state board of education composed of laymen, most often appointed by the governor but in a number of cases elected, has come into being. All states have a chief state school officer. In over half of the states the chief state school officer is selected by the state board of education and serves as its executive officer, while in the remaining states his relationship to the state board of education is less well defined.

But the development of this special government does not take education out of general government. The state legislature retains plenary power for education. The legislature may create special machinery, may charge state boards and state superintendents with particular functions, as it has done, but it may also alter the machinery and call back the functions. Moreover, the governor's budget is still a most persuasive instrument with most legislatures. State boards and state superintendents may recommend to the governor a budget for the schools of the state but neither the governor nor the legislature is required to accept such recommendations. Thus, at the state level special government for education supplements but does not replace general government.

More national influence

Only since the depression of the 1930's and World War II has national influence in the governance of education been appreciable and sustained. To be sure, we had the land grant college and the vocational education acts, but most public school systems had little to do with the federal government except

as a modest amount of federal money was distributed through state departments of education for certain vocational programs. During the depression, with the advent of such programs as WPA, PWA, NYA, and CCC, the schools felt some national impact. Federal funds were used to build or renovate school buildings, provide student aid, establish nursery schools, and feed students from poor families. In addition, CCC Camps and NYA Schools became, in a sense, alternative school systems.

Most of these federal programs were disbanded as we went to war in the 1940s. Upon the conclusion of the war the G.I. Bill of Rights created, among other things, our first national scholarship program and both schools and colleges felt its impact. Also following the war the Congress passed the National Science Foundation Act in 1950, the federal impact laws (PL 815 & 874) in the same year, and the National Defense Education Act in 1958. The 1960s saw the passage of much educational legislation including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

It is clear that federal influence has increased appreciably. Most of the support provided has been categorical in nature. Much of it has been aimed at programs designed to equalize educational opportunity for the poor or to compensate for inadequate prior opportunity. The federal courts, particularly through the Brown decision and subsequent litigation, have insisted that the schools take the lead in desegregating our society. This position has perhaps done more to point up our national dilemma than any other policy decision at any level of government. At the same time, it has placed tremendous implementing obligations upon many school districts and most state departments of education

Another example of federal influence is found in legislation designed to strengthen state departments of education. The Congress transferred, for the most part, the administration of the ESEA, Title III funds for experimental projects, from the U.S. Office of Education to state departments of education.

As part of this transfer, however, there has been an insistance on the part of OE that states evaluate these projects, indeed that states evaluate all federal projects. Since most states had little capability in evaluation, there has also been federal money provided to establish such capability. The lack of planning and evaluation capacity in state departments has also been noted by Congress and OE and much of the money available through ESEA Title V and Title IV, Section 402 has been for the development of planning divisions in state education agencies. This new money for evaluation and planning has required state departments of education to rethink their functions and their structure, not always comfortable demands. Moreover, in trying to strengthen state departments, particularly in preconceived directions, The federal government has made such departments very dependent on federal financing. Actually, in 1969 federal funds accounted for forty-one percent of all state department expenditures.[1] Strength and dependence are hardly compatible. It should also be noted that any success in strengthening state departments goes counter to our long tradition of localism in the governance of education.

Another aspect of national influence has been the multiplicity of federal administrative agencies with which states and local districts must deal. Mrs. Green[2] has noted the fragmentation of federal effort and has suggested greater consolidation and coordination of federal programs in education. Each of several federal agencies deal with local school districts and state agencies. One example of this is the action of HEW in the desegregation programs in many school districts. If districts are not conforming to the law and to the administrative regulations developed by HEW a finding of non-compliance may be filed against the district. If remedial

---

[1] Mike M. Milstein, "The Federal Impact on State Agency Planning." Planning and Changing. V 2 (April, 1971) 31-38.

[2] Report of the Special Subcommittee on Education, Study of the U.S. Office of Education. Committee on Education & Labor, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

action is not taken, the case is taken to the courts. At times, it seems that the officials in HEW interpret the desegregation policy of the federal government much more rigorously than does the Congress. These diverse interpretations make action at the local school district most difficult to plan and to implement.

In many ways federal influence on education has been more pervasive than the federal funds provided would suggest. This influence seems to stem from two conditions. One, the federal money has been for special purposes and the implementation of these special purposes has had consequences for the entire operation. Two, the U.S. Office of Education appears to see itself as the chief mover of educational reform. In addition to these consequences of federal action, federal practices in the distribution of money have been particularly galling to school administrators. Appropriations are frequently very late, funding is nearly always on a one year basis, program emphases change almost yearly, and the OE and other agencies are reorganized and personnel changed so frequently that it is almost impossible to retain contact with the agencies.

More state influence

I have already suggested that state departments of education were exercising more control over education, frequently in response to federal action. But this movement seems to stem from many other sources as well. Conant[1] and others have suggested that states take over the primary financing of elementary and secondary education. Some governors have actually recommended to their

---

[1]James B. Conant, Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

legislatures programs designed to move in this direction. If the state finances all or a large part of the expenditures for public education, I think it follows that the state will exercise considerable discretion in how the money is to be expended.

Or, if the state pursues a program of more planning and evaluation, this will have repercussions not only for the state agency but for the local districts as well. In many ways these activities are geared to the push for accountability to which we have already given attention. It is not inconceivable that states will require some kind of cost benefit data from school districts if they are to participate fully in state funding. Particularly, is this the case since financial outlays for education have gone up faster than the gross national product and thus represent unprecedented demands upon state government.

Encouragement of alternative schools

In many ways both national and state governments have encouraged the establishment of alternative educational systems. For instance, in Titles I, II, and III of ESEA nonpublic schools or at least pupils in nonpublic schools were to be given support. Title I provided that both public and nonpublic schools enrolling pupils from poor families were to receive help. Title II stipulated that library and instructional materials were to be made available to public and nonpublic schools. Experimental programs, provided by Title III, were to be funded through local school districtes but those districts were required to work with other agencies, including nonpublic schools, in the planning and operation of such programs. Such legislation seems to be an extension of the concept of child benefit as set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court in Cochran.

Federal precedent and the financial needs of nonpublic schools have caused many state legislatures to consider ways by which public money might be used for nonpublic education. Recently, for example, the Illinois legislature established a study commission and authorized the commission to secure outside

research help in analyzing the situation in Illinois. . Under the direction of Donald Erickson a comprehensive report[1] was prepared and became the basis for a legislative program in this area. Many state legislatures have already provided some support for nonpublic school pupils. Often at the state level the argument is advanced that nonpublic schools will close without public assistance and such action would add greatly to the cost of public schools and in the end require more tax revenue than the partial support of nonpublic education. Erickson, in the study noted above, makes a number of other arguments for the support of nonpublic schools including one growing out of the need to preserve considerable cultural diversity in our kind of society. The acceptance of these arguments does not remove all constitutional questions nor does it dispense with all of the opposition, but it does suggest a willingness on the part of many persons to consider an alternative to the public schools.

Also outside the public school structure, has been the development of a number of new institutions under a variety of names. Sometimes these are known as informal schools and are organized by a group of parents who wish much more flexibility and humaneness in the education of their children than seems to be found in many public schools. Most of these schools enroll a small number of pupils, frequently they are for young children but some have been organized for adolescents, one or at most a few teachers are involved and they are often young and committed to a free and flexible learning environment.

Other protest institutions have been called store front schools or street academies. The store front schools in Harlem have attracted considerable attention for the success they apparently have had in dealing with dropouts. Other examples include the Highland Park Free School in Boston and The Learning

---

[1]Donald A. Erickson, Crisis in Illinois Nonpublic Schools. Research report to Elementary & Secondary Nonpublic Schools Study Commission, State of Illinois, December, 1970.

Place in San Francisco.

The U.S Supreme Court has just decided that plans of state payments to nonpublic school teachers for their teaching of the secular subjects, at least in the states of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, unconstitutional.[1] While this is a set back for nonpublic schools, I suspect that the logic of providing nonpublic schools with partial funding and the political support for such a program will lead to new legislation designed to avoid the unconstitutional aspects of current statutes.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has also given support to the testing of educational arrangements out of the traditional public school approach. In the year just closed as noted above, OEO provided almost seven millon dollars to test the idea of performance contracting in twenty local school districts. In each case, one or more private firms have contracted to provide instruction to a group of pupils for a period of one school year and to guarantee a certain level of achievement or forfeit payment for such service. At this time the outcome of such an experiment is hard to predict but the very nature of the program casts some doubt on the capacity of the public school system to perform its chief function, the instruction of the young.

Not to be outdone, the Office of Education has provided an investigator with money to explore the voucher plan. Under this arrangement a parent might send his child to a school of his choice, public or nonpublic, and submit his voucher, collectable from tax money, as payment for the schooling. I understand that feasibility studies of the voucher plan are to be made in three school districts in 1971-72. These and other efforts at both national and state levels highlight the need some people have to seek alternatives to the public school system.

---

[1] Lemon V. Kurtzman, June 28, 1971.

Local boards still have a place

As already suggested both national and state governments are exercising greater control over education and all indications are that such a movement is not yet at an end. Two developments help explain this trend. The first is the increasing importance citizens generally place on education, even though they may become skeptical of certain schools and school practices. A second reason is found in the ever increasing costs of education. In other words, the importance and the cost of education make it a national and state problem and not chiefly a local problem as once was the case.

This situation is often interpreted to mean that local boards of education exercise less and less discretion and the time may be approaching when they can be eliminated altogether. There are many motivations for such a prediction. Boards are sometimes seen as getting in the way of the professionals, teachers and administrators. Or, boards are seen as containing some of the demands of citizens, particularly minority groups. At other times, boards are seen as unresponsive to the bureaucrats in state and national government.

I doubt that any of these groups are going to wish away boards of education. Moreover, I point out that local school boards have a most important role to play in the governance of education, despite national and state influence. Indeed, some national and state action can give local boards opportunities which did not previously exist. Particularly is this true if school boards see themselves chiefly as ministerial bodies, as was intended from the beginning, with some policy making and judicial functions as well.

GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS AT EACH LEVEL

At the local level

Just as there are problems of governance among levels of government, there are also problems of governance at each level of government. At the local level the issue is one of long standing. School districts have been seen as

state agencies and as such are relatively independent, with some exceptions, from municipal government. This autonomy has been cherished by boards of education, superintendents, and citizens generally. Frequently, it has been defended as the way of keeping politics, or at least political corruption, out of the schools.

Actually, as James[1] and his colleagues have shown, no school district has complete autonomy or independence; rather school districts have different degrees of dependence on other governmental bodies. The categories of dependent and independent as applied to school districts are thus not very useful. Moreover, James was not able to demonstrate that degree of dependence had much to do with the revenues made available for school purposes.

These findings, notwithstanding, the question still remains, should school governance be part of general local government and be related more closely to the governance of parks, recreation, health, social service, and the courts. Clearly, these other functions can and do affect the educational function. For instance, youngsters needing health care are poor learners. School play grounds and city parks seem to have a natural affinity. The taxpayer is well aware of the rapid increase in property taxes and makes little distinction between the tax demands for schools and other local government.

Many school districts have been slow to recognize these interrelationships and have been loath to join even in a plan of voluntary coordination between education and other social services. This relative independence of school districts has caused some mayors to seek legislative relief. For instance, in the school building area the independence of both the New York and the Chicago school districts has recently been curtailed by the use of a local building authority designed

---

[1]H. Thomas James et.al. "Wealth Expenditure & Decision Making for Education," Cooperative Research Project No. 1241, U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

to consider building needs of all governmental units, including school districts. Townsend[1] has recently studied the transfer of power from the Chicago Board of Education to this new Cook County authority which is presumably more sensitive to the Mayor, who is also Chairman of the Cook County Democratic organization, and to all agency building needs in the county. It seems probable that other inventions of this kind will follow.

As noted above, the presence of special government for education is most pronounced at the local level. At this level the long tradition of separation between special and general government will make new arrangements difficult to establish. At the same time, such factors as the increasing urbanization of our society, the growing conviction that school problems are also city problems, the recognition that education goes forward in many settings, the increasing costs of all public services, and-despite folklore to the contrary- the more clearly perceived fact that the control of education is in the political arena suggest that present arrangements will be scrutinized and changed when need be.

At the state level

Problems of educational governance may be even more severe at the state level. Forty-eight of the fifty states, and soon that will be forty-nine[2], have state boards of education. In most cases these board members are appointed by the governor but in nine states they are elected. In few cases have state boards of education been strong bodies regardless of their method of selection. Sroufe[3] found that boards in most states had low visibility and that board members were relatively unknown and indistinquished whether appointed or elected. As board members have very modest self expectations, others expect little

---

[1] Richard G. Townsend, "New Schools for Chicago: A Political-Administrative Analysis." Ph.D. Dissertation, Dept. of Education, Univ. of Chicago, 1971.

[2] The new Illinois constitution, adopted in 1970, provides for a state board of education.

[3] Gerald E. Sroufe, "State School Board Members and the State Education Policy System." Planning & Changing. V.2 (April, 1971) 15-23

from such boards and little is received.

The impotence of many state boards is further emasculated by the fact that in 21 states the chief state school officer is elected by popular vote and hence cannot be held accountable by the board or any other agency of government. The long hassle in California between a former board and superintendent illustrates the problem. Even when the chief state school officer is appointed by the board, it is often difficult to secure a strong person. This condition stems from at least two causes: weak boards seldom attract strong executives, and state school administration is not generally as prestigious as local school administration, particularly in major cities or select suburban districts. In most states we are thus left with mediocre boards and executive officers of moderate ability who often have a need to weigh every action in terms of its contribution to re-election.

These public officials exert little leadership in education. They tend, instead, to perform the regulatory duties ascribed to their offices. Until recently, this state of affairs seemed acceptable to most people. Local school district official and most citizens were quite content to have little power exercised at the state level and more discretion at the local level. Even governors and legislators were comfortable to have the education agency play a modest role. But the situation has changed.

The size of the education budget at the state level has become so large that it must be weighed against other fiscal demands. The pressures to support nonpublic schools have mounted. Reservations about the purposes, procedures, and outcomes of the whole educational enterprise have been entered. The need for school reform seems clear. In short, more information about education, its organization, its operation, and its results is being demanded by governors, legislators, and citizens generally. All of this has been augmented by the insistance that quality education be made available to all people, including our minority groups.

All of these pressures make governors more aware of educational problems and more determined to play some role in educational reform. Legislators, too, have been forced to come to grips with educational questions as never before. As a result the tranquil life of state boards and superintendents has come to an end. More and more these officials are being asked to provide more information, more planning, more evaluation as well as to perform their customary regulatory functions. Federal funds, as noted above, have been made available to help state agencies perform these new functions. But the new demands and the new resources do not necessarily create willingness and capability on the part of the state departments.

As a result governors and legislators are often forced to turn to other agencies and sources for information. At the same time, there is active consideration in many states regarding the reorganization of the state education arm. Some governors would dissolve state boards and make the state superintendent responsible directly to the governor. Again, this is the expression of the issue of general or special government for education.

At the national level

I have already alluded to some of the problems of educational governance at the national level. These include the multiplicity of federal agencies dealing with education and the administrative difficulties engendered by frequent change of program emphasis, lack of lead time for planning, and instability of federal support. But there are more deep-seated problems. These stem in large part from uncertainty regarding the role the national government should play in education. Is it to be limited in scope and deal only with a few apparent national needs such as providing better opportunity for the poor? Or, is it to recognize that education is so much a part of our total national well being that it deserves broad and substantial support from federal sources? Categorical aid seems to be more closely related to the first position, while

general aid or block grants of some kind are perhaps more compatible to the second position.

Whatever policy positions regarding education are taken by the federal government, there is still the question of congruence among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. This is not easy to achieve for the reason that education does become a part of many other functions. For instance, the schools have become a major battle ground for civil rights. Many of the decisions handed down by the courts since Brown have been in the civil rights context, frequently with little regard to their overall educational consequences, particularly the fact that local schools must maintain the support of local citizens or they cannot operate.

Organization of the administrative branch at the federal level to serve education is still a difficult question. In terms of size of operation a good case can be made for removing the U.S. Office from HEW and setting the education agency up with a cabinet level head. President Nixon, on the other hand, has proposed a Department of Human Resources which would include not only what is now located in HEW but more as well. These are very divergent views that require consideration.

Within education itself organizational questions are demanding attention. A National institute of Education, patterned somewhat after the National Institutes of Health, has been proposed.[1] The Levien report would place the Institute in HEW and coordinate with the U.S. Office of Education. Others would make it a part of the U.S. Office. One aspect of the issue is whether the research function should be separated from the funding of operational programs. When these functions are placed in the same office, as at present,

---

[1]Roger E. Levien, "National Institute of Education: A Preliminary Plan for the Proposed Institute." Report prepared for HEW, 1971.

research and development needs seem to take second place to the needs of the operational programs. Health and agriculture have apparently been more successful than education in channeling resources to research. At the federal level the problem seems to be much less a case of general vs. special government for education and much more a case of deciding the role of the federal government and developing adequate governance structure for education within the general government.

TOWARD A RATIONALE

We have noted a number of the strains and stresses affecting education. We have considered some of the problems of governance among levels of government - local, state, and national. And we have also observed some of the problems of government at each of the levels of governance. We are now at the point of saying what should be done about all of this. Once again I wish that the study to which I alluded earlier had been completed so that I might have a more adequate base from which to make these projections. In the meantime, here are some tentative propositions.

Interdependence

First, we should look upon the local, state, and national governance of education not as three separate and distinct systems of governance, each jealous of its own perogatives, but rather as a total governance system with great interdependence among the subsystems. We have learned that there is no way by which certain functions can be placed at any one of the three levels and be completely ignored by the other two levels. Indeed, as Grodzins[1] has pointed

---

[1]Morton Grodzins, "The Federal System," in Goals for Americans. Report of President's Commission on National Goals, Englewood Cliffs,: N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1960, ch. 12.

out, federalism is a plan for sharing the functions of government and not a plan for separating them. Moreover, this is not a new idea; it has been inherent in our federal system from the beginning.[1] Perhaps the relative unimportance of formal schooling in a frontier society helped develop our strong tradition of localism in education. In any case, federalism in the governance of education languished for much of our history. Since World War II this has changed.

There are good reasons to support the concept of federalism, even in education. First, we are no longer a rural but an urban, technological society characterized by great mobility of population. Second, our society was postulated on an informed electorate, necessary at all levels of government, and our early land grant acts as well as state constitutions made it clear that citizenship, as it came to be called, was a major purpose for establishing public schools. Third, education and training provide not only economic benefits to the individual but they contribute to the economic well being of the entire nation. Finally, only at the national level can the matter of equal treatment for all, even in education, be assured. Each of these points could be explicated but that is not my purpose here.

Another characteristic of our federal system is its capacity for a problem to be "bucked" from one level to the next. If citizens at the school district level feel dissatisfied with their treatment at the hands of the local board of education, they may generate a movement for change and carry it to the state department of education or to the state legislature. In like manner, dissatisfactions at either local or state level may ultimately find expression and frequently action at the national level, either on the part of a agency of

---

[1] Roald F. Campbell & Gerald R. Sroufe, "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education", Phi Delta Kappan. 46(Sept. 1965)2-7.

the administrative branch or on the part of Congress itself. For example, the movement toward decentralization in cities, notably in Michigan and New York, has been achieved through appeal to state legislatures. Frequently, the application of civil rights in education as in other spheres has been appealed to the national level. Again, the interdependence of the three levels of governance is exemplified.

This is not to say that each of the three levels of government can not have some focus in the total context of governance. I think for instance, that the major responsibility for the operation of schools should remain at the local level. With state constitutions and state statutes being what they are, it is clear that the chief legal responsibility for the establishment and support of schools is at the state level. I think that responsibility should remain there and be exercised more vigorously, as I shall argue later. Only at the national level can a complete picture of national needs be seen, hence, I believe the national government should pay genuine attention to national needs and provide resources to cope with such needs. This is at best a gross division of basic responsibilities and should be seen within a total system of governance where interdependence and flexibility are always present.

For the successful operation of the federal system each of the levels of governance must be strong. One of the greatest arguments for the consolidation of small, sparcely populated school districts is for the preservation of local government, not its destruction. A puny school district has very little voice in interactions with state or national agencies. In similar manner state education agencies must be strengthened if they are to interact effectively with national and local agencies in the governance of education.[1] In recent years,

---

[1]See Roald F. Campbell, et.al., Strengthening State Departments of Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1967.

we appear to have had a great increase in national influence, sometimes without much interaction with state or local agencies in education. I seek some redress in this balance. In other words, I would like to make our interdependent system truly interdependent.

Focus at state level

Second, the chief focus for the improved governance of education should be at the state level. This is not to deny needed improvements at both local and national levels, some of which are noted below, but the state, it seems to me, occupies a unique position in our system of governance and that position has been largely unimplemented. In the first place, as noted above, states are legally responsible for the establishment, operation, and support of public schools and they have general jurisdiction over nonpublic schools as well.

States have delegated the actual operation of public schools to local districts and I think that such delegation should remain. However, even delegation needs some surveillance. Moreover, delegation does not remove state responsibility for the establishment, support, and general supervision of the school system. In exercising that responsibility states occupy not only a unique legal position, they occupy a pivotal position in the whole federal system. States, even more than local districts or national agencies, can make federalism work. States can provide appropriate feed-back to the Congress and the administrative branch. States can also give careful attention to the operating problems faced by local school districts. Many of our governance problems stem in large part from inattention, lack of competence, little courage, or inadequate revenues at the state level.

Some of the state inadequacies may be due to structure but I suspect the malady is more than that. Structure is at best a means to an end. Even so, structure may make it easier to follow improved procedures, hence, we must

give some attention to structural arrangements. In my view, state boards of education should be retained and state board members should be appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate. I take this position for three reasons. First, I think the governor should play an important role in the governance of education and thoughtful exercise of the appointment function can contribute to that role. Second, I think that a governor who takes his appointment function seriously, is in a better position to place able and representative citizens on the state board of education than is an elective procedure where inevitably state board candidates are far down on the ballot and little known to the electorate. Third, able and representative citizens appointed by the governor are in a good position to interact with the governor regarding the problems and needs of education in the state. I realize that appointment procedures have not always resulted in these outcomes but I still believe they can. It may be desirable to establish a nominating mechanism in a state for the purpose of identifying suitable candidates for the governor's consideration. Gubernatorial appointment, if implemented, would require that the election of state board members be discontinued in some states. In many states it would require that appointment procedures be taken much more seriously.

As a second structural change, I would make the chief state school officer an appointee of the state board of education and have him serve at the pleasure of the board. Only in this way can the board be adequately staffed and can the executive officer be held accountable. Election of the chief state school officer, still the practice in twenty-one states, is an anachronism which should no longer be permitted. I realize that some very able men have been elected. I also know that board appointment does not guarantee competent executives. Despite these caveats, if we are going to rationalize our structure at the state level I think chief state school officers must be selected by state

boards and made responsible to them.

Let us now turn from structure to function. I think it important that state education agencies continue with their regulatory functions. In many cases, these functions need to be performed even more faithfully than they are now. At the same time I am convinced that state agencies need to provide leadership in education far beyond what most of them are now doing. This leadership function will require substantial augmentation of planning and evaluation activities.

Planning is almost unknown. To be sure, in recent decades there has been some planning for higher education, particularly on the part of state coordinating boards for higher education. At the school level, there has also been some planning in terms of physical plant needs. Beyond these two examples, neither school districts nor state agencies have made much use of planning procedures. Planning involves the setting of goals, the generation of information relative to those goals, and the projection of programs, both short-term and long-term, to achieve the goals. Obviously, goal setting is a political process in which many must share but the state education agency can do much to see that a planning climate is established and that educational and political leaders have something to consider. Crisis budgeting, now so prevelant at both district and state levels, can be changed only by the perspective which can come through long-range planning.[1] Planning on the part of the state education agency hopefully in conjunction with the general planning arm of the state, for meeting state-wide education needs should also lead to more planning at the local level for district-wide needs.

Evaluation is closely related to planning. Indeed, when evaluation is broadly defined, as it has been by Stufflebeam,[2] it means the generation of

[1] See Edgar L. Morphet & David L. Jesser, Emerging State Responsibilities for Education. Improving State Leadership in Education, 1362 Lincoln St., Denver, Colo., 1970.

[2] Daniel Stufflebeam, et.al., Educational Evaluation & Decision Making. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock Pub. Co., 1971.

information for decision making. Activities are of four kinds: context evaluation or situational analysis, input evaluation or consideration of alternative courses of action, process evaluation or assessment of procedures, and product evaluation or determination of outcomes. This formulation takes nothing away from the importance of the traditional concern about results but it adds appreciably to the total concept of evaluation.

Evaluation in this larger context can be viewed as a management system. It bears a relationship to management by objectives, to program budgeting, and to cost analysis. Whether or not we follow the precise Stufflebeam formulation, it seems very important that state education agencies have a continuing program devoted to the analysis of the social and educational conditions of the state; to the development of alternative courses of action designed to cope with these conditions; to the presentation of these alternatives, with supporting evidence, to the state board of education, to the governor, to the legislature, and to many other groups; to a continuous system of evaluating the processeses followed in the implementation of adopted programs and consideration of the outcomes of such programs; and to a recycling of information about both process and outcome so that such programs might be improved, augmented, or dropped.

Few structural changes are needed to permit state education agencies to augment and improve their planning and evaluation functions. What is needed is a determination on the part of chief state school officers and state board members to institute such programs, learn to work with them, and modify internal organization and procedure to take account of a more rational approach to state problems. Once internal capability has been established, there may still be the problem of implementing the approach with local school district officials and the political leaders of the state. In many cases these persons are already demanding approaches of this kind.

National Changes

Third, the governance of education can also be improved at the national level. In terms of structure, two major changes are called for. To begin with, agencies dealing with education should be substantially reduced in number. While it is probably not possible nor desirable to place all educational functions in the U.S.Office, it would seem entirely possible to place the administration of most of the operating programs in that office. There appears to be considerable merit in separating the projected National Institute of Education, which is to be devoted to research and development, from the administration of operating programs.[1]

With the emergence of education as an important national function, a second structural change is suggested. In some way the status of education should be raised in the federal government. One alternative is that of giving the chief education officer cabinet rank. Or, if the Nixon plan of a department of human resources should be implemented, a prominent role for education should be established within that department. Perhaps, following the pattern established in the Defense Department, there could be a Secretary of Education. Responsible to the secretary might be the U.S. Commissioner for the operating programs in education and a coordinate officer in charge of the National Institute of Education. If education remains in HEW, at least an associate secretary for education in that Department might serve as chief for the Commissioner and for the Director of NIE, assuming its establishment.

Where reassignment of education functions to the education agency is not feasible, much more attention should be paid to coordination among agencies at the federal level. For example, in the desegregation area at the present time, it appears that the position of some of the HEW people is quite

[1]See report of Commission on Instructional Technology, To Improve Learning. Committee on Education & Labor, House of Representatives, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1970.

different from the position of the Congress. One way of testing this is for states and institutions which have been given findings of non compliance by HEW to resist such findings and review them with their congressional delegations and if need be to let them go to the courts for determination. In other words administrative regulations may have to be tested by the legislative or judicial branch of government.

Even at the judicial level, recent court decisions may have gone beyond Brown. In any case, some of these decisions appear to have little regard for the over-all consequences of some of the desegregation measures required of school districts. The insistance on racial balance in the schools of Richmond, Virginia, for instance, has apparently resulted in the migration of whites from that city to the point that the Board of Education is now in the federal courts contending that it cannot achieve racial balance in the schools unless the two neighboring county-wide school districts are annexed to Richmond. I, for one, wonder how far we go to achieve racial balance. What distances are pupils to be bused to achieve that end? How much resistance among both white and black parents can be incurred? What evidence do we have that the only road to quality education is through the mixing of the races? Is desegregation the only value with which we are concerned? In many places, disregard of over-all consequences of desegregation measures is actually destroying public support for the school system.

Turning from structural coordination to the financing of education at the national level, a number of changes are recommended. To begin with, total revenues available should be increased. There is considerable support for this position. Education does contribute to the social good on a nation-wide and not merely on a state or local basis. Mobility is a characteristic of our society, hence, educational deficiencies in any part of the nation tend to affect other parts of the country. In a more positive sense, increased knowledge through research and graduate training for scholars and high level professionals create

national resources and add to national manpower pools. Only at the national level can nation-wide needs be identified and adequately supported. It is also true that some states are less able to support educational programs than others, hence, federal aid, among other things, should provide some equalization at the national level. It seems entirely reasonable that the national contribution to school support might be raised appreciably. In like manner, as suggested by the Carnegie Commission[1], support for higher education both to institutions and to students should be increased.

As more money is allocated to education, attention must be paid to the educational functions to be supported. As noted above, national support of research, development, and graduate training seems quite clear. Actually, the chances of support for educational research are meager at state and local levels, hence, if federal funds are not made available there will be little research and development in education. But federal funds should also be made available for operating programs designed to meet pressing educational problems and to supplement state and local effort in other operating areas.

These considerations suggest that federal aid might take two forms. Categorical aid might be continued when it is clear that severe problems require national effort. In addition, block grants, revenue sharing, or general aid might be made available to the states to supplement state funds for special and general educational purposes as defined at the state level. This supplementation will become even more critical as states assume a greater share in the financing of schools.

The U.S. Office of Education, other national agencies having to do with education, and the Congress can do much to improve the operation of the federal program. To begin with, federal programs should be established as the

[1] Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education. Report of the Carnegie Commission, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

result of planning procedures and should come to represent some kind of sustained effort. In other words, state and localities should be able to depend upon some kinds of federal support. As part of this procedure the U.S. Office and other agencies should provide sufficient lead time so that projects and programs submitted by state departments, school districts, and institutions can be carefully planned and, after approval, can be appropriately staffed. Finally, there must be developed, as there has been in some other departments, a plan of continuing or multiple year funding. Present practices of hastily contrived staffing subject to year end dismantling should be discontinued.

Local changes

Fourth, the governance of education at the local level should be improved in both structure and process. In terms of structure, I think the consolidation of sparcely populated rural districts should continue. Instead of 18,000 operating districts we should probably have about 5,000. Both enrichment of program and economy of scale argue for further consolidation. In this reorganization it would be helpful if school district boundaries were made to coincide with the boundaries of other governmental units whether a city, a county, or several villages and their surrounding areas. Coterminous boundaries would make collaboration between school districts and other jurisdictions much easier. Obviously, this implies some rational plan for the organization of other governmental units as well as school districts.

Within cities some kind of decentralization is called for. In most cities this will not require, in my judgment, the breakdown of city-wide school district into a number of legal entities. In many cases, it seems to me that regional sub-districts could be formed administratively without establishing a number of new legal entities, each largely autonomous and jealous of its own powers. I take this position for two reasons. First, there are many things that should not be decentralized such as the raising of revenues for school

operation. Second, I doubt that there will be true decentralization until each building unit in a city has considerable autonomy. This condition may be harder to achieve in multiple city districts than in a single city district.

While I think there is much to be said for the idea that each school district should be able to offer a program from kindergarten through grade 12, a criterion often used in guiding the reorganization of school districts, this goal poses constraints as well as advantages. It suggests to many school board members, legislators, and to citizens generally that any programs not falling within the magic K-12 formula may be less necessary or even undesirable. Actually, school districts should be free to set up nursery schools, adult programs, community colleges, vocational training, and experimental programs of many kinds if the educational needs of the people require them. If for some reason regular school districts do not have state authorization or revenues to organize and operate many kinds of programs, the creation of special districts for such purposes should be possible. These special districts, such as the one for special education in Saint Louis, County, Missouri, could work closely with regular districts in performing particular services. Intermediate units in rural areas might also be authorized to serve as special districts for programs not feasible in many smaller units. My point is that regular school districts should have program flexibility and the possibility of creating school districts for special purposes should also exist.

I am not yet ready to put school operation in the hands of the mayors and the city councils. I am ready, as noted above, to make school district boundaries, wherever feasible, coterminous with those of other jurisdictions so that there is a better basis for the consideration of common problems. I also believe that there must be much more collaboration between and among school districts, city governments, and agencies representing recreation, health, welfare, housing, employment, and law enforcement. Some of these agencies are

municipal, some are county, some are state, and some are national. All of these agencies contribute, directly and indirectly, to the education of the child. That relationship would be made explicit and should be nurtured positively.

In the selection of school board members I think we must find a way of making boards of education more representative. I am convinced that a board made up of our "best" citizens does not sense adequately the educational problems confronting many people, particularly minority groups and the poor. There must be a willingness and a procedure whereby some of the leaders of minority groups can be represented on boards of education. In most school districts this can probably be done through the electoral process. In large cities where the electorate has difficulty getting information about the candidates, an appointment system by the mayor may be preferable to popular election.

Boards of education, generally, need to change some other practices. More adequate arrangements for the participation of citizens in school governance should be developed. In my view, this can be done on a wide-spread basis only if provided for at the level of each school. This is another reason why I support the idea of decentralization to the building unit. School boards also face a particularly knotty problem in resistance to change found in many teachers organizations. Boards can no longer dictate to teachers, neither should they take dictation from teachers. A way must be found whereby the expertise of teachers can be taken into account along with the demonstrated needs of students, the values espoused by the parents, and the expressed will of the larger society.

In a pluralistic society, such as ours, and particularly with respect to an important function, such as education, there will be conflict. School boards must prepare themselves to deal with conflict. One step in conflict resolution is to make the board itself more representative, as suggested above. Another is to provide for citizen participation at many levels, also noted above.

A third is to select a board chairman who has some facility in conducting a meeting, in providing for delegations to be heard, in permitting debate, in dealing fairly with all persons, and in terminating unnecessary discussion. The time is past for honorific chairmen; skilled presiding officers are needed. Finally, conflict resolution requires accurate information, a point to which we now return.

School boards have traditionally made decisions upon the recommendations of their superintendents and often boards and superintendents have had little reliable information as background for such decisions. Even more significant than the paucity of relevant information has been the fact that most boards have had no system by which information could be supplied or by which the value positions involved could be made explicit. That situation must change. The demand for accountability, for the reporting of results, for program budgeting, for cost-benefit analysis all argue that school boards must have better planning and evaluation capability. Larger school districts should establish planning and evaluation units of their own and such services should be made available to smaller districts on a collaborative basis of some kind.[1]

By way of summary, I have suggested that formal education is at a critical point in our history. Part of this condition may be ascribed to a general disenchantment with our established institutions but part of it is also due to conditions surrounding schools and colleges themselves. I have indicated that the schools, particularly, are under many strains and stresses including great concern with their nature and purpose, the growth of alternate systems, the push for new structures, the demands of new participants, financial distress, and finally more vigorous intervention from state and national agencies. Consideration was then

---

[1]See New Dimensions of School Board Leadership. A seminar report, Evanston, Ill.: National School Boards Association, 1969.

given to some of the governance problems among local, state, and national levels; and to some governance problems at each of these levels. Finally, I turned to a consideration of at least a beginning rationale for an intergovernmental approach to the governance of education. Major points were: first, a need to recognize, not the separation of powers at local, state, and national levels, but the interdependence of the total governance system; second, the pivotal position of the state in making our federal system work, and the need in states to update their structure and build in planning and research capabilities; third, the need to give education a more stategic place in the structure of the federal government, to augment federal aid for both categorical and general purposes, and to build in some stability to that financial support; and fourth, the continuation of local school districts but with some restructuring in both rural and urban areas and with more collaboration with other governmental jurisdictions. These changes require a rational approach to our problems, a conviction that structure must be made to serve program, and a continuing quest for accountability in government.

RFC: djr